

Appl. No. 10/709,462  
Amdt. dated July 31, 2007  
Reply to Office action of May 25, 2007

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the specification, the paragraphs [0014], [0015], [0017] and [0018] have been amended to correct minor editorial problems. No new matters are introduced.

5

Claims 1-4, 8-9 and 11-20 remain in this application. Claims 5-7 and 10 are cancelled without prejudice, and claims 12-20 are newly added without entering any new matters.

10

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. Applicant has carefully considered the examiner's opinion and made an amendment to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the remaining claims for at least the reasons set forth herein.

15

**Response to the claim rejections:**

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones (U.S. Patent No. 6,873,279) in view of Jayaraman (U.S. Patent No. 7,046,726). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

20

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate most limitations of the original claims 5 and 7. Applicant asserts that the amended claim 1 is patentable over Jones in view of Jayaraman because they fail to teach or suggest a combination of all of the limitations of claim 1. Since claims 2-4, 8-9 and 11 are dependent upon claim 1, if claim 1 is found to 25 be allowable, so to should the dependent claims.

**Remarks for the newly added claims:**

Applicant asserts that the newly added claim 12 is patentable over Jones and Jayaraman because they fail to disclose a combination of all of the limitations of claim 12, especially a combination of the following limitations: “a control logic, coupled to the quantizer, for controlling the quantizer to apply the first slice mode or the second slice mode through executing the following steps: subtracting the equalized signal from a predetermined level to obtain a first value; determining whether the quantizer is in a first status or a second status according to the first value; if the quantizer is in the first status, controlling the quantizer to apply the first slice mode; and if the quantizer is in the second status, controlling the quantizer to apply the second slice mode”. Since claims 13-16 are dependent upon claim 12, if claim 12 is found to be allowable, so to should the dependent claims. Besides, Applicant further asserts that claim 17 and it’s dependent claims 18-20 are patentable over Jones in view of Jayaraman for at least the same reasons placing claim 12 in condition of allowance.

**Conclusions:**

Therefore, all pending claims are submitted to be in condition of allowance.  
20 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if there are informalities that can be resolved in a phone conversation, or if the Examiner has any ideas or suggestions for further advancing the prosecution of this case.

Appl. No. 10/709,462  
Amdt. dated July 31, 2007  
Reply to Office action of May 25, 2007

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 07.31.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.  
is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)

15